Gase 5:07-cv-06122-JW Document 16-3 Filed 02/04/2008 Page 1 of 3

1 2

4

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

3 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201, Carl W. Jasper hereby requests the Court to take

judicial notice of the content of the following documents in support of his Motion to Dismiss the

Complaint: 5

	1	
6	Exhibit A:	Complaint in Securities and Exchange Commission v. Maxim Integrated
7		Products, Inc. and John F. Gifford, Case No. 07-6121(RMW).
8	Exhibit B:	Final Judgment as to Defendant John F. Gifford in Case No. 07-6121 (RMW),
9		entered January 23, 2008.
10	Exhibit C:	Final Judgment as to Defendant Maxim Integrated Products, Inc. in Case No. 07-
11		6121 (RMW), entered January 23, 2008.
12	Exhibit D:	Maxim Integrated Products, Inc.'s January 17, 2008 Press Release entitled
13		"Maxim Provides Update on its Restatement."
14	Exhibit E:	The Security and Exchange Commissions' December 4, 2007 Press Release
15		entitled "SEC sues Maxim Integrated Products and Former Senior Officers in
16		Stock Option Backdating Scheme."

I. **ARGUMENT**

Judicial notice of the documents identified in Exhibits A, B and C above is appropriate because these are court documents filed in another proceeding which are "directly related" to this motion. See, e.g., U.S. ex rel. Robinson Rancheria Citizens Council v. Borneo, Inc., 971 F.2d 244, 248 (9th Cir. 1992)(taking notice of a California state court's final judgment); Adobe Systems, Inc. v. St. Paul Fire and Marine Ins. Co., 2007 WL 3256492 at *2 (N.D.Cal 2007)("The complaint is subject to judicial notice pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201."); Santa Monica Food Not Bombs v. City of Santa Monica, 450 F.3d 1022, 1025 n. 2 (9th Cir. 2006)(A court may take judicial notice of public records). It is appropriate to consider such documents on a motion to dismiss. US v. Ritchie, 342 F.3d 903, 907-908 (9th Cir. 2003)(In evaluating a rule 12(b)(6) motion, a court may properly consider documents external to the complaint by judicial notice.).

Gase 5:07-cv-06122-JW Document 16-3 Filed 02/04/2008 Page 3 of 3

1	As to Exhibit D and E a Court may take judicial notice of documents which are "integral		
2	to plaintiffs' claims" and whose "authenticity is not disputed", even where the documents are not		
3	explicitly incorporated into the complaint. <i>Parrino v. FHP, Inc.</i> , 146 F.3d 699, 706 (9 th Cir.		
4	1998); In re Calpine Corp Securities Litig., 288 F.Supp.2d 1054, 1076 (N.D.Cal 2003)("In a		
5	securities action, a court may take judicial notice of public filings when adjudicating a complaint		
6	for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted."). Press releases concerning the		
7	SEC's inquiry into Maxim's stock option practices as well as Maxim's restatement are "integral		
8	to plaintiffs' claims" and are the sort of public document of which a court may take judicial		
9	notice. Jones ex re. CSK Auto Corp. v. Jenkins, 503 F.Supp.2d 1325, 1339 (D. Ariz.		
10	2007)("Judicial notice is appropriate for SEC filings, press releases and accounting		
11	rules.")(Internal citation omitted). Further, a court may take judicial notice of public records		
12	without converting the motion to dismiss into a motion for summary judgment. <i>Id</i> .		
13	For those reasons, Mr. Jasper respectfully requests that the Court take judicial notice of		
14	the contents of Exhibits A, B, C, D, and E.		
15			
16	Dated: February 4, 2008 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP		
17	Steven M. Bauer Robert E. Sims		
18	David M. Friedman Risha N. Jamison		
19	Christopher W. Johnstone Heather L. Thompson		
20			
21	By:		
22	Risha N. Jamison Attorneys for Defendant Carl W. Jasper		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			